



# **External evaluation of the first program report phase**

**April 27, 2018**

***Josué León  
Sayra Taleno  
Andrew Blackwell***

## Content

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1. Introduction, Objectives and Evaluation Methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Context evolution</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 Remarkable aspects of the biophysical and socioeconomic context	1
2.2 Political and institutional context for water management	2
<b>3. Analysis of the Expected Results with the Program</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Relevance and Effectiveness of the Program</b>	<b>4</b>
4.1 Water management and community management of watersheds	4
4.2 Farming practices	4
4.3 Local financing	6
4.4 Social inclusion	6
4.5 Relevant local organizations	8
4.6 Water governance and management	9
<b>5. Basin Management development</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 Basin organizations competence	13
5.2 Relationship with local governments	14
5.3 Management and program management	15
5.4 Sustainability	17
5.5 Immediate priorities	18
<b>6. Lessons Learned in Phase I</b>	<b>19</b>
6.1 Context Key elements	19
6.2 Program experience Key elements	19
6.3 Potentially key bases to build	20
6.4 Lessons to optimize efforts impact	20
<b>7. Main conclusions and recommendations for a second phase</b>	<b>20</b>
7.1 Program goals	20
7.2 Programmatic organization	22
7.3 Management organization	23
Annex 1. Participants in meetings and conversations with the evaluation team	24
Annex 2. Scheme that groups the objectives, key issues, transversal axes, and guiding questions, raised in the Evaluation Terms of Reference.	28
Annex 3. Assessment grid for projects evaluation / SDC programs	30
Annex 4. Summary of progress and difficulties related to the Logical Framework indicators	32
Annex 5. Examples of agricultural practices	34

## Executive Summary

Between February 19 and March 12, 2018, the evaluation team visited producer families in the three zones of the Basin and met with key stakeholders in the basin organizations, national and local governments, and local organizations. We tried to follow the principles of a "beneficiary assessment", letting the conversations be guided by the interests and perspectives of the participants. This report presents what we found in meetings and field visits, sometimes confirming what is stated in the program and in some areas suggesting changes in the focus and priorities of the implementation work.

The availability or absence of reliable sources of water is a factor that determines notable differences in the biophysical context and also in the economic and psychosocial context of the communities in the Basin. The important role that rural banks play in productive and economic dynamics is also remarkable. The Program has gained credibility in the communities with attentive technical support to productive families, and technical, organizational and financial support to water boards and rural banks. It has also succeeded in organizing and / or strengthening 13 micro-watershed councils with the participation of water boards, rural banks and other local organizations. In recent months, it has made progress in coordinating its contributions at a family, community and micro-watershed levels in three zones of the Basin, but a more complete articulation is needed to ensure that support for changes in productive practices to be consistent with the biophysical needs and micro-watershed action plans.

The program participates in a dialogue with the Lenca Table that is laying the foundations for a more effective inclusion of the interests and worldview of the indigenous people, especially in the upper zone where there is an important effort to rescue Lenca values at the community level. . There are also ongoing initiatives by women's groups and young people in various communities that provide a basis for developing the incipient inclusion of gender, psychosocial, and social and ethnic inclusion in the program's action strategies.

From the consolidation of the micro-watershed councils, the participation of the Apasapo River Sub-basin Council, and the creation of the Goascoarán River Basin Council commissions in the three zones of the Basin, the Program has begun and must prioritize work approach in the relationship between basin organizations, municipal governments and, especially, the associations. To address the critical problem of water availability and quality in the Basin, an inter-community, inter-institutional, inter-municipal, and inter-donor coordination will be necessary.

As a result, some of the key lessons learned in Phase I are:

- the progress of community management is conditioned by the particular biophysical and socioeconomic conditions of each micro-watershed.
- the most common agricultural practices increase vulnerability and lack of water makes it difficult to introduce new practices;
- "Benefits" and remittances that do not change practices subsidize increasing vulnerability.
- the focus on water is motivating and generates sustained organizational efforts.
- the strengthening of rural savings banks psychosocially empowers local leaders.
- developing the ability to manage money and change the environment transcends the value of the particular "benefit" of a loan or project.
- with basin awareness, local leaders extend their vision of community development to an inter-communal and inter-municipal vision that incorporates a water focus.
- the relationship with the Lenca community can be strengthened by supporting the recovery of ancestral practices in technical assistance.

- the associations can open the door to the alignment of donors contributions and to a harmonized regulation.
- the donations of the cooperation, the credits provided by rural banks and the private capital of the remittances, coordinated, could finance major investments that break the vicious circle of lack of water, "traditional" production and increased vulnerability.

Suggestions of priorities for the general operative work and in each zone in the year 2018, are:

General	Explore a unique strategy of support to the national government with the Project of Water Governance. Generate comprehensive reports by area (linked with council plans where possible) instead of separate reports by consortium member. As a sustainability strategy, prioritize support for agro-businesses and explore ways to increase the potential of financial contributions from the same communities.
Zona Alta	Improve relations with municipalities. Develop a relationship with MAMLESIP Increase strategic coordination with donors, especially USAID.
Zona Media	Seek for a more effective support for micro-watershed councils, similar to what Fundación Vida offers in the lower zone and ASOMAINCUPACO in the upper zone. Take advantage of the opportunity for close coordination with MAMSURPAZ and its advisory board
Zona Baja	Renew participation of Fundación Vida Support coordination between municipalities (Alianza, Goascorán, Caridad, Aramecina) and associations (MAFRON, MAMSURPAZ) Explore ways to approach the coastal zone with the Water Governance Project

For the second phase, it is recommended:

- for the design of the program, that SDC involves the pertinent actors in the process of defining the goals of three lines of action:
  - community work to address adaptation to climate change and the development of local economic sustainability;
  - inter-institutional work to address global water management in the Basin of Goascoran River; and
  - monitoring and communication of biophysical and socioeconomic effects in the Basin.
- a tender for an operating agent (in which members of the current mandatory consortium and / or its sub-contractors may participate) which includes, as a requirement, a commitment to negotiate the way to move from a contract with SDC to a set of posts located in a secretariat of the Basin Council and / or units in the relevant Associations until late 2021, with the understanding that the posts will be financed by SDC within a third phase of the program.
- a Directive Committee composed of SDC, the Basin Council, the managers of the ICUs UTI of the Associations and MiAmbiente; an operational-technical committee with the president's director, the coordinators of the operational sub-teams of the three zones, and the SDC program officer; and a national basin policy advisory committee that includes, among others, the General Direction for Water Resources (DGRH) and the NCG representatives and the Water Governance Project.

## **1. Introduction, Objectives and the Evaluation Methodology**

Between February 19 and March 12, 2018, the evaluation team met with five micro-basin councils, a sub-basin council and the Basin council; We spoke with leaders of rural savings banks, water management boards, and other local organizations in each area; We interviewed four mayors, a vice-mayor, several staff members of the municipal corporations, and the technical teams of three Associations; they showed us and explained how six community works financed by the Program were built; we talked with three focus groups; met with leaders of three NGOs working in the basin; and had nine long visits on farms, to learn about the living conditions and perspectives of families that have taken full advantage of the technical assistance offered by the Project, others partially benefited, and others that do not participate in the Program. (Annex 1 is a list of people and groups that gave us their perspectives on the problematic in the basin and the contribution of the Program.)

As far as possible in a short evaluation, we follow the principles of a "beneficiary assessment", letting the conversations be guided by the interests and perspectives of the participants, especially in visits to producing families and focus groups. In this report we present our observations on what we found in meetings and field visits, sometimes confirming what we read in documents prepared by the consortium that manages the program and in some areas suggesting changes in priorities and / or ways to focus the implementation work.

To organize our observations, suggestions, conclusions and recommendations, we combined the "objectives", the "key issues and transversal axes", and the "guiding questions" raised in the evaluation terms of reference in the scheme presented in Annex 2, which was used to organize the draft report. After receiving comments from the staff of the SDC Cooperation Office in Honduras, we cut out the text, reorganizing it in the structure indicated in the terms of reference. We have tried to ensure that this reorganization does not affect the clarity of the inhabitant's perspectives of the communities in the Basin. We caution, however, that the previous experience and perspectives of the evaluation team members necessarily influence the way we have interpreted the implications of what they expressed to us, and we assume full responsibility for the ratings in Annex 3, and for the conclusions and recommendations presented in the last chapter of this report.

## **2. Context Evolution**

### **2.1 Remarkable aspects of the biophysical and socioeconomic context**

Throughout the Goascorán River Basin, a marked biophysical differentiation between sites with water and areas without water determines the socioeconomic context: there is a notable difference between the living conditions, attitudes, perspectives, and opportunities of those who have water and those who do not. . There is a general difference between the upper zone and the rest of the basin. Also, in the middle and lower zones, the few producing families that have a water hole or a functional well on their farms can apply new agricultural practices; their daily life is easier; they manifest hope. Families and communities that have a reliable water source told us about progress, achievements and plans. With families and communities without a reliable source of water, the conversations revolved around difficulties and frustrations. Some showed determination to continue with their efforts, efforts that were oriented, in the first place, to look for water and to seek support to get water.

In the high zone, they have lots of rain and abundant water sources combined with a Lenca cultural appreciation of harmony with nature. A self-image of being protectors of the forest and water are sometimes expressed as a contrast to the destructive materialism of the ladinos who dominate the country in general. The economic perspective is one of cautious hope. Hope is based on decades of good income from coffee production, and a growing experience with vegetables and other products.

The caution is expressed in frequent references to the recent biological impacts of rust on coffee and the weevil in pine forests. Some leaders in indigenous communities perceive political and natural threats that put at risk their capacity to continue protecting water and forests to ensure their use by future generations.

In the middle zone and the municipalities of Caridad and Aramecina in the lower zone, we find a generalized feeling of a lack of opportunities. In some communities they said that before there were safer water sources, however now it is accepted that there are not any more. Likewise, the emigration of young men to look for work is accepted as normal. The remittances they send have varied effects: for some people, remittances facilitate their commitment to community work; thanks to the dollars sent by the children, they have the freedom to participate in water boards, savings banks, or micro-watershed councils and the possibility of investing in new water harvesting practices and patio crops. Thanks to remittances, they persistently participate in efforts to adapt to the lack of water. For other people, remittances solve the problem of lack of water and remove the need to adapt: they simply buy the water they need.

In the municipality of Alianza, the reality is different. The border, the sea, the cattle plains, shrimp farming, a larger urban population, and the commercial and tourist movement present alternatives to hillside agriculture. The contamination of the Goascorán River, the waste that generates a plug before the exit to the Gulf of Fonseca, and the salinization that affects some wells in the area create an awareness of the need to address water problems.

## **2.2 Political and institutional context for water management**

Water management in the Basin depends mainly on voluntary water boards, organized at a community level, sometimes with some level of participation or support from the municipal government. They do not have usage meters and the basic hydro-climatic information available is minimal.

In 2009, after several years of discussion and socialization with different sectors involved, the General Water Law was issued. This law grants the Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment (SERNA), today MiAmbiente, the leadership to organize the water institutions and therefore watersheds in the country. After the law was published, several years passed without the beginning of the expected implementation through the creation of the National Water Authority (ANA) and its operational dependencies.

At the beginning of 2010, a process was initiated for the construction of the Country Vision that would become operational through the Nation Plan and that led the law for the Establishment of a Country Vision and the Adoption of a Nation Plan for Honduras (Legislative Decree No. 286-2009). In the next governmental period that began in 2014, this initiative was frozen due to the restructuring of the state secretariats that merge the Secretariat of Planning and External Cooperation (SEPLAN).

Three government institutions-the Ministry of the Environment (MiAmbiente), the Permanent Contingency Commission (COPECO), and the National Electric Energy Company (ENEE) - have networks of rain gauge stations, but they do not coordinate with each other, nor do they share the information they collect with municipal governments and community water boards.

### **3. Analysis of Expected Results with the Program**

The first expected effect of the first phase of the Program is focused on activities of producing families and community organizations. With families, an attempt has been made to measure the adoption of new agro ecological practices as part of the implementation of farm plans and, in 2016, resulting increases in the production of corn and beans. The consortium reports figures suggesting that the goals outlined in the Logical Framework will be achieved; In our visits we observed that some families that have not participated in the Program have also adopted effective agro ecological practices and that the families that have participated began their adoption of such practices before the start of the Program. Apparently, NCG is building on the basis of multiple projects that have offered technical support to agriculture for decades in the Basin territory.

With community organizations, rural savings banks are expected to increase access and use of credit by producer families, and that organizations supported by community works-mainly water boards-ensure their maintenance. We were able to confirm that rural banks have a strong presence in the three zones of the Basin, and that members can access funds subsidized by NCG with preferential interests for the agro ecological practices implementation. We confirmed, in addition, that the water boards organize voluntary work for the maintenance of the improved systems with the community works, although the rates for the service in general are too low to accumulate the necessary funds to face future capital expenses.

The second effect refers to micro basin councils, and the consortium reports on indicators related to their legalization, regulations, annual plans, conflict resolution, support through municipal budgets, payment mechanisms establishment for environmental services, and social and financial audit process.

Taking into consideration that some of the councils, particularly in the middle zone and the lower zone, are of recent formation, the progress reported and that we were able to verify represents a significant achievement of the Program. The process of legalization has been delayed, but the cause has not been flaws in the local organization but the low priority and lack of resources assigned by the national government to the Water Law implementation and weak coordination of the government with the local authorities. The lack of national prioritization also limits the possibilities of support from the municipal budgets because they depend mainly on national contributions, although in other areas of the country there are municipalities with greater poverty and with fewer transfers from the central government that are investing funds in management processes of natural resources.

One limitation in the Logical Framework and the indicators used is the lack of measurement of the relationship between micro-basin plans, community works and farm plans. It must be ensured that priority is given to the areas and actions identified as priorities in the micro-basin plans when community works are selected and where they are located. It is important, also, to prioritize critical areas for soil conservation and recovery, and for reforestation, when promoting the adoption of agro ecological practices and their financing with preferential rates: we observed some farms where the financial and technical resources of the Program had been dedicated to support good practices of patio production while they continued to plant extensions of corn on slopes without soil conservation measures and water retention.

In its 2017 report, the Technical Management Unit (UTG) presents a table that provides a summary of the progress made in 2017 and in the period 2015-17 related to each one of the indicators in the Program's Logical Framework. In Annex 4 we reproduced that table with the addition of a column where our comments are presented.

## **4. Relevance and Effectiveness of the Program**

### **4.1 Water management and the community management of watersheds**

As indicated above, from the perspective of the vast majority of people living in the Basin with whom we spoke, the key factor for the quality of life in their communities is the availability of water and any activity that improves it is highly relevant. NCG's central focus, highlighted in the formal name of the Program, is the Community Management of Watersheds. Watershed management is not a traditional activity in Honduran communities, but the management of community water supply systems for human consumption is. In this context, the effectiveness of the Program depends on its capacity to add to this community management an inter-community coordination and to facilitate an expansion of the approach to include the uses of water, the conservation of its sources, and the other interactions in the micro watersheds. And among them that determine the availability and quality of water in the long term. A key interaction is between water and soils; particularly on the slopes where agricultural practices can facilitate or prevent erosion and increase or reduce the infiltration of water into the local aquifer.

The goal is ambitious and not in short-term; requires changes not only organizational and leadership training, but also psychosocial changes that bring new perspectives and attitudes: a cultural change. The axis of cultural change is one of passivity and a feeling of helplessness before the difficulties of living in poor communities with lack of water, towards a proactivity based on the perception that community groups can take actions that improve their living conditions. This proactivity is already evident in the leaders of the water boards, and through the management of the local supply systems the residents in the communities have evidence that local management is possible. Therefore, the continuity between the efforts of the Program and the historical processes of the water boards is fundamental to confirm the relevance of the program and its effectiveness. In this respect, the recognition of the work developed by the NGOs present in the area is notable. The leaders of the community organizations that manage and administer the water systems and provide leadership for the micro-basin councils identify the importance of the support they have received, particularly from ASOMAINCUPACO in the upper zone, Fundación Vida in the middle and lower zones and, in a more limited area, ADEC in the middle and upper areas. The participation of these NGOs locates the NCG in the historical context of the community organizations and strengthens the appropriation, relevance and effectiveness of the Program contributions as a whole.

### **4.2 Farming practices**

As in other parts of the country, during the last forty years, producer families in many of the Goascoran River Basin communities have been the beneficiaries of material contributions, training and technical assistance from multiple projects financed by international cooperation for development. Some projects have promoted agro ecological practices; others have had (and have) other approaches such as value chains for good markets, and support the use of pesticides and agrochemicals that increase short-term yields.

The NCG Program has promoted an extensive menu of agro ecological practices in combination with the farm plans making, using a combination of extension methods that include individualized technical advice, group training, local exchanges between producers, and reference farms. We observed that the producer families in the farms visited value this support. Many expressed appreciation for the program's technicians; sometimes making explicit a contrast with technicians from other projects who do not show the same interest, perseverance and personal solidarity. They also showed us innovations in their farms that they attribute to the NCG intervention, indicating that they are part of an estate plan that they identify as their own. We can affirm that, in general, the Program contribution is strengthening the proactive attitude of the participating families and improving their agricultural production.

At the same time, however, we identified two characteristics that represent serious limitations to the contribution effectiveness. The first is that, currently, in most of the visits we make, extension



work seems to reflect a general rural development trend, rather than watershed management for adaptation to climate change. The process of accompanying production families by service providers only partly follows the dynamics of determining interventions based on the biophysical conditions of the place and the areas where there is a higher impact on soil conservation or degradation. We saw, for example, some farms where NCG has supported micro-actions at the flat yard level while maintaining unchanged practices that facilitate erosion in the larger sowing areas on the hillsides (see Annex 4).

The second limiting characteristic is the lack of systematic integration of support to producer families with the activities carried out by the Program with community groups and micro-watershed councils. The promotion and implementation of technologies is more effective as families understand the true meaning of a basin as a whole (biophysical elements, relationships, social ties, cultural aspects, productive activities, etc.). Water resources, soil and tree cover are integral parts of the micro-watersheds and must be treated jointly. Specifically, the methodological technical instruments used with families (farm plans) and with river basin organizations (action plans) must not be disconnected. The farm plans must generate a joint reflection among groups of families that articulate bet to generate changes in their production systems (coffee, basic grains, pastures, fruit trees, vegetables). From there, a series of actions must be generated that go beyond the farm and that intentionally and planned to allow the production practices development associated with the recovery and protection of the soil (hillside areas) and the water resources around them. The micro watersheds, generating significant and sustainable changes in the medium term.

In this logic, the contents of the technical accompaniment must be harmonized, structuring them to respond the needs that families reflect in their farm plans. In turn, the series of actions derived at the community level from the farm plans should contribute to define the work contents of the rural banks and the action plans of the micro-watershed councils. The different land uses in each of the areas of the basin must be discussed and agreed upon in the micro-basin councils and be part of their local governance action plans.

One related aspect to the practices socialization of producing families that contribute to the good management of a micro-basin is the identification and socialization of examples of these practices, regardless of those who implement them and when they were made. We observed very good examples of dead barriers, reforestation, and level curves in water recharge areas that were made years before the start of the Program, some by producers who have never participated in activities promoted by NCG (see Annex 4). Particularly notable is the wealth of local knowledge of the Lenca groups in the upper zone. Some knowledge is related to ancestral practices (selection of seeds, use of landraces, sowing systems, food storage practices, etc.) that have been carried out for years and are still valid in the development of production systems. These practices must be rescued and be part of the initiatives promoted as adaptation actions to climate change.

### **4.3 Local financing**

The rural banks have prestige, positioning, representation and autonomy in the communities. FUNDER, other than being a member of the consortium that executes the NCG Program, has a history of supporting the savings banks in several municipalities of the Basin. Many savings banks are developing actions that go beyond granting credit to families. Members of rural banks show a particular interest in environmental issues; sometimes, they are linking access to credit with this issue through measures such as restricting the use of insecticides, not burning, and reforesting the farm and water sources. The latter is more accentuated in the middle and lower zone. There are examples where environmental protection issues have already been incorporated into the internal regulations of these community organizations.

From this base, a strengthening process could be considered for the definition of more specific policies related to the protection and recovery of soil, water and forest. It could stimulate initiatives such as green credits, compensation for environmental protection, credits for productive activities related to soil recovery and forest cover, with low interest and longer term<sup>1</sup>. This would be very attractive to families, in a context where rural savings banks are the financial monopoly.

With the NCG some actions have been initiated aimed at offering lower interests for productive activities that offer economic and eco-systemic advantages (banana plantation, vegetables with irrigation systems, fruit trees, and production of better species, among others). However, under the logic of strengthening community structures in environmental management, it is necessary to connect the allocation of these amounts of credits with the actions in the micro basins that are focused on the protection plans and recovery of water resources and the floor.

### **4.4 Social inclusion**

The approach to the participation of young people, women and indigenous peoples deserves to be deepened in a second phase of the program<sup>2</sup>. Through the dialogue initiated with the Lenca Table, we are looking for ways to make visible and support the indigenous people in the articulation of their own culture, identity, values and worldview, with particularities in the way of conceiving relationships with the environment and nature. This effort is courageous and should continue, perhaps with a strategy of forming a facilitating team for the second phase that includes experienced personnel in the recognition and rescue of the different logics associated with the worldview of the different groups that live in the basin.

In use, access and control of natural resources and particularly water resources, there are unequal relationships between men and women, young people and indigenous peoples. The consequences of poor management affect them differently and live distinctly the consequences of environmental degradation. Understanding and addressing this reality is necessary to develop sustainable processes. In this stage of the program, the actions taken to increase effective inclusion are incipient and still of low impact. The action plans of the micro-basin councils lack products or activities that explicitly address the interests and needs of groups of young people, women and indigenous peoples. If these groups are not attended according to their demands and interests, unequal power relations are reproduced and potentiated. The councils of micro watersheds, water boards and rural banks are spaces of power in the communities. Progress has been made but, still, for the most part, management positions are in the hands of men, which can make the interests of women and young people invisible.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interest rates in rural banks have a range of 2% to 4% per month.

<sup>2</sup> In the logical framework, there are only two indicators that address the gender issue (1.3.3 Gender strategy implementation in effect 1 and 2.6.5 Gender strategy implementation in effect 2) and one for ethnic groups (2.4.7 Support strategy for the Lenca platform). The approach of these articulated topics with the rest of contents of the components of the program is not achieved. They must be explicit in each of the defined products and not as an appendix, apart from the defined products.

In the different zones of the basin we found elements that show that there is an important participation of women in some spaces and community dynamics such as:

- rural banks exclusively women (for example, in Canciri in the upper zone); women directing rural savings banks (for example, in Aramecina in the lower area).
- groups of women with agro-businesses or small businesses and micro-enterprises (in the three zones).
- women directing community structures such as rural banks and water boards and leading community projects (for example in Terrero-Aramecina in the lower area).
- women directing micro watershed councils (for example, in La Victoria in the lower area); In general, women occupy other posts in the micro-basin councils (39% are women).

We also find places where young people are making their way towards participation in the decision-making spaces of community and municipal organizations. Some examples can be highlighted:

- young people with an important advance in education at the head of water councils (Santa Ana, in the upper area) and forming part of other councils (13% of young people in basin organizations).
- groups of young people with business entrepreneurship (Santa Ana in the high zone<sup>3</sup> and Aramecina in the lower area).
- young people in charge of municipal initiative for safe water access<sup>4</sup> (Aramecina in the lower area).
- young people in charge of radio programs (Aramecina in the lower area).
- young people as rural advisors in the process of collective learning (in the high zone).
- young people at the head of religious organizations (Aramecina in the lower area).

These actions represent an opportunity to enhance the participation of women and youth in different components of the program, as long as they are accompanied by processes of capacity building that begin with the preparation of the technical teams of the consortium and the organizations that provide the services. In order to address these issues, institutions that are members of the consortium should continue with the institutionalization of gender contents, psychosocial, and social and ethnic integration approaches in their action strategies. In order to develop actions that change power relations in families and community and local organizations, a speech is not enough, especially when the technical teams that make up the consortium in the three zones are exclusively men. If the consortium partners and service provider organizations do not have policies and methodological instruments for the practical application of these issues, the results will remain at the level of intentions and isolated experiences.

On the other hand, the integration of the educational community (teachers, students and parents of families) and religious groups would be of great importance in issues of sensitization, which would allow access to an education and awareness space with a view to the adoption of new practices, habits and behaviors related to the use, care and protection of water resources. Particularly for the management of solid waste, which is one of the most serious problems in the basin, it is necessary that more local actors could be integrated into the initiatives promoted by the micro basin and sub-basin councils.

---

<sup>3</sup> In Santa Ana (uptown), an initiative is being developed with young people to make orange wine.

<sup>4</sup> In Aramecina (low area), a group of young people is in charge of a water purifier "Living water for the world".

#### **4.5 The relevant local organizations**

There are important differences between the three zones in the population organized in the basin organizations. The type of interest it has and its level of capacity depends on the organizational history in each context. In the upper zone, the organizational, developed and institutionalized capacities of the water boards stand out. There is a cultural habit of active participation in groups and the establishment and legalization of a water board is taken as a normal part of what the population does in each community. There is a wide experience with the management of local drinking water systems and we observe cases with important generational change in leadership, with an effective transfer of practices required for a good operation, administration and maintenance of the local system.

In the high zone, community management was also evident, demonstrating that water boards, in collaboration with other local organizations, address local problems, identifying and taking advantage of available opportunities and resources. We also see examples of strong leadership exercised by women, backed by a good base of women's organizations in some communities. The Lenca Culture of defense of nature is manifested in an opening towards organic farming. Unlike the other zones, the "no burn" is interpreted broadly, as a prohibition of the use not only of fire, but also of agrochemicals.

Despite the remarkable level of volunteer work and local financial contributions, we note that the leaders interviewed do not value their own local contributions as a potentially sufficient support to keep community work going. They see them, rather, as a mechanism to leverage larger resources from projects and programs of international cooperation. At the same time, we felt that, in general, they value projects and programs mainly as sources of resources that local organizations can take advantage of to strengthen themselves. It was common to hear expressions that indicate a contrast between projects and programs financed by cooperation, which are temporary and passing, and water boards and other local organizations, which are permanent and their own.

In the middle zone, local organizations do not show strong roots in the communities. The local leaders with whom we met talked about water boards and rural savings banks, as well as micro-watershed councils, as creations of projects or programs in which they participate. They showed willingness to comply with what a project demands in order to obtain the benefits that it leaves, and, in particular, interest in doing what is necessary to obtain support in obtaining water. Despite having representatives in the same micro watershed councils, the water boards and rural savings banks did not show much articulation among themselves, and in no case did they express their own vision of community action.

It seems that to some extent an effect of the lack of a secure source of water is a lack of hope and energy necessary to dream, visualize a better future, and act to generate it. We heard some comments about the lack of compliance by members of the boards, boards and rural banks, expressed by other members who feel impatient with the apathy of others.

It is noted, however, that this apathy is surmountable. In the lower area, where the lack of water is just as severe, the interest and capacity of local organizations is very different. The council of the sub-basin Apasapo was created 10 years ago in the municipality of Aramecina in the lower part of the sub-basin. After a conflict over a mining exploration in the upper part of the basin located in the municipality of Curarén in the department of Francisco Morazán, they took the initiative to invite the communities of the upper part to join the Council. Now the Council represents 89 hamlets with a total population of more than 9,000 people, in four municipalities. Its leaders show a strong commitment to the continuity of the inclusion and dialogue process that is carried out through the Council. They appreciate the support of the NCG, as well as the collaboration of the Fundación Vida that accompanies them since 2007, but they state that the existence of the Council does not depend on any program or project: they maintain it and will maintain it with their own effort and voluntary work.

In conversations held with leaders of water boards and rural savings banks supervising the construction of community works in the lower zone, their insistence on the importance of developing their capacities to carry out collective activities and manage funds was notable. They clearly expressed that, even more than the works themselves, they value the learning they acquire through their execution and supervision.

The differences between the three zones in the appropriation and valuation of local organizations by the people who participate and direct them, determine important variations in the perception they have in the role of the micro watershed councils. We believe that the descriptions in the following table roughly reflect the differences in those perceptions.

Micro watershed councils role perception <sup>5</sup>		
High zone	Middle zone	Lower
Coordination instrument to obtain resources and support for activities of water boards and other organizations.	One more of the forms of organization required by projects that offer benefits that may be useful.	Own means of integration of diverse local interests that fight to be heard by local authorities, national government and international projects.

#### 4.6 Water governance and management

The General Water Law (Decree No. 181-2009) in article 19 mentions that *"the councils of basins, sub-basin and micro-basin are instances of coordination and coordination of actions of public and private agents involved in multisectoral management in the territory of the basin"*. The law assigns them the mission of proposing, executing programs and actions for the good administration of waters, development of hydraulic infrastructure and the preservation and protection of the basin water resources. In general, the micro watershed councils in the Goascoran River basin have been organized under this decree.

The organizational structures of the micro-basin councils are well represented by grassroots organizations. In all cases, the organization is attached to the General Water Law mandate of Article 22. Each council has the General Assembly as the maximum authority and the Board of Directors as a management body. The assembly is composed by two (2) accredited representatives of each grassroots organization, be it community or municipal. The members of the Board of Directors are democratically elected by the General Assembly in the positions of president (who acts as legal representative), vice president, secretary, treasurer, fiscal and five boards.

With this structure, the Board of Directors is composed by 10 members. Likewise, the members coordinate special commissions, such as surveillance. During the interviews, it was possible to identify that the members of the Boards of Directors are aware of the role of the micro-watershed council as an organization as a whole.

In practice, the organizational base and backbone of the 16 micro-watershed councils are the Water Boards and the Rural Savings Banks. This does not mean that there is no participation of other community organizations, but rather specifies that the other organizations, such as the patronages, the women's network and others, which are less linked to the use of water and soil, do not normally play the role of leadership in the councils.

---

<sup>5</sup> This perception is built on the information and opinions of the interviewees when asking about what is the most important mission of a council.

The councils at the micro-basin level present different levels of maturity. Most still have weaknesses because they lack their own resources, legal status, government support, and face-to-face technical assistance, especially in the middle zone. The Goascoran River Basin Council also lacks the same elements. The structure of the Basin Council is formed in a representative manner, with members of all micro-basin councils, municipal governments, associations and other civil society organizations such as ASOMAINCUPACO.

In some cases (for example, the Cancire Council in the upper zone), a strong identity was found with the grassroots organizations they represent (water boards, rural savings banks) but not with a multi-stakeholder governance platform for the agreement in a territory. This trend is more accentuated in the upper and middle zone and contrasts with the two councils of the Apasapo sub-basin and the Coast of Amates micro-basin.

One of the limitations that these organizations face is the limited access, use and distribution of information on climate variables; This will be an important element that could contribute to make the right decisions, to define the lines of the micro-watershed councils work, as well as to promote and adopt practices and technologies associated with CCA and DRR processes. This is a subject that should receive strengthened attention, taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the different areas of the basin with the existence of weather stations.

The low level of territorial identity with the micro basin is consistent with the management and actions promoted by most councils. The projects and community works developed with funds from NCG and the municipalities respond to community demands prioritized within the council, but, so far, do not seem to result from the water management analysis of problems in the corresponding micro basin as a whole. Ideally, coverage and implication projects should be identified throughout the micro-watershed and applicable to a water logic. The identification of initiatives and collective projects such as good management of honey water and coffee waste in the recharge areas, would be examples of projects that help to create identity with important territories for water management.

The council's legalization: A level of wear, fatigue and even disappointment is perceived at both the watershed and the basin level due to the lack of legal status. Possibly this demotivation has been transmitted from the technical team, since some of its members also identify it as the most important barrier in the way of the consolidation of the councils.

When we found this concern, we posed the question: *"What would be the difference between having this legalization document or not?"* In all the watershed councils and the basin council, they responded that legal status would allow them to manage projects and the funds management independently. This clear goal of obtaining funds may contradict the most important objective of a council: that of being a space of agreement, rather than an operating entity executing projects.

The relationship between micro-watershed councils is an issue that can be improved in NCG's implementation strategy. Also, at the level of the Council of the Basin, despite having the participation of several mayors, there are aspects that must be overcome in the relations with all municipal governments and the associations. We consider as extremely positive the emphasis that is being placed on achieving a good integration of the micro-watershed councils processes and actions with the MAMSURPAZ agenda in the middle zone.

The program's articulation and the micro-basin councils with other projects in the basin is very weak. This situation should improve with the new strategy of commissions by area. The institutional support commissions are a window in which we must dedicate effort and energy for their integration and good functioning. Another strategic action that must be adopted is the development of internal exchange tours, led by the councils in which the participation of the population in the communities is involved in order to know their micro-basins (emphasis on young people and women). Where they exist, advantage of local media must be taken, such as, for example, Aramecina's community radio. An additional action is to promote regular meetings of exchange between the councils of the different zones and internally between each zone.

One aspect that is worth highlighting is the work in the training of the leaders of grassroots organizations and the councils that ASOMAINCUPACO is carrying out in the upper zone. The elaboration of water action plans, in addition to strengthening cognitive capacities, is contributing to an appropriation of a micro basin joint vision. This capacity building will last beyond the action of any project.

As indicated above, a pending challenge is to articulate the farm-home plans with the water action plans in each micro-watershed. To achieve this, the member's participation of the zone technical team in the formulation workshops is unconditional. If this articulation is achieved, there will be a connection of the actions from the farm, through the community to the micro-basin.

An adjustment in the approach strategy with a greater territorial focus is a step that must be taken now that the councils are consolidating. It is probable that there are already criteria that will allow an analysis of the priority areas of water recharge that can be identified with the support of popular knowledge in combination with the technical one. This territorial approach would allow having a differentiated location of rural bank members in order of priority by the water logic, favoring those who are located in critical areas.

An aspect of special attention on the role of micro watershed councils that could be differentiated by zones, is the vision regarding the management of natural resources in the micro basin. While in the high zone they are identified as organizations in favor of the defense of natural resources, especially the forest, in the middle zone the agenda revolves around the provision of water service in particular. In the case of the councils of the lower area, they convey a clear idea that their reason to be is to promote platforms for dialogue and negotiation around water as a strategic resource in the micro-basin and to respond to an overwhelming problem and greater how is the management of garbage.

In the micro-basins of the upper and middle zone it is perceived that the motivation of the community organizations belonging to the councils is the execution of projects that favor their represented communities. This eagerness, to a certain extent, turns their agenda into an activism that is temporarily losing them of focus. There is a risk that the councils leave aside the vision of water as the main resource that connects the other components of the micro basin territory.

In the lower area, as mentioned above, the two councils are motivated and act differently, perhaps because they have not yet reached the appointment with the implementation of community projects. The council of the sub-basin of the Apasapo River emerged with the motivation to stop mining, but has evolved to maintain dialogue among the stakeholders of the basin, regardless of the municipalities' agenda, departments, national government and donors. Similarly in the Coast of Amates, the situation is very particular due to the territorial coincidence of the basin-municipality, as well as the broad agenda of activities in the micro-basin and the size of its population. At this moment we work hand in hand with the priorities included in the Municipal Development Plan. A priority issue, among others, is the handling of garbage. These two cases represent a great opportunity for the learning program on issues of local governance of watersheds.

A topic that should be part of the agenda of the micro-watershed councils, with greater depth in the middle and lower zones, is the economic value of water. This aspect has not been addressed with the implications that merit. It should be noted that NCG has promoted exchange tours to learn about other experiences in which the micro measurement of water for human consumption is successfully implemented. The interviewed actors are very enthusiastic about having known the experiences, however, we should not let the flame of interest go out and start sowing the seed that in the future will be the key to good water governance.

Planning: The action plans of the councils that were accessed in the upper and middle zone are limited to a list of activities that are not very binding on the territories of the micro-watersheds. These activities, as already mentioned, are oriented towards community demands. In the absence of 2018, NCG should focus efforts to improve these plans and articulate them with a comprehensive vision. It is expected that this situation will improve with the process of elaboration of the water action plans that are currently facilitating with good success and with Fundación Vida leadership. With this approach, the action plans of the councils will be integrated by productive actions, conservation actions and management actions and protection of the micro basin and its water sources. They must align the actions that are developed at all levels, understanding that what families do is closely related to the actions developed by the micro-watershed councils. It should be possible to bet on changes and results in an ascending sequence from the actions in farm plans, through actions of rural savings banks, water boards, and other projects, and reaching actions in the micro basin.

The articulation of the different approach scales will provide the roadmap for the governance in the field, which establishes the individual farm as the intervention and management unit and is part of territorial spaces composed of microbasins and sub-basins that act as planning and analysis units. These are governed by the corresponding councils tending to the local problems and challenges and utilizing existing potential.

It should be noted that there are some differences between the three zones, both in terms of participation and representation and the level of incidence. The 5 micro basin councils of the basin's upper area have a marked organizational antecedent of the Lenca people. In addition, they are dominated by water boards and have a good generational relief (for example, the Paniaguara council and the water board in Santa Ana). Through the actions of the Program, the council of Cimarrón, which was conformed solely by water boards, was strengthened with the participation of other community structures such as patronages and rural saving banks.

In terms of incidence, the micro watershed councils are still in the initial phase. In fact, it is perceptible that partisan tendencies affect the relations between the municipality and the water boards, and therefore the councils. In general, the micro watershed councils see national government bodies as adversaries and not as partners in the natural resources defense. Likewise, the councils assume functions that are the responsibility of the State, which is not bad, if they are developed as complementary work.



## Summary characterization of the Micro watershed councils

Analysis element	Upper Zone	Middle Zone	Lower Zone
Representativeness, leadership and basic structure	Water boards and second rural banks, then boards and others.	Rural banks, Water boards producers and municipal leadership.	Each different advice. Strong rural savings banks with the participation of Boards of Water and many others organizations
Basin motivation and awareness	Conservation of natural resources, especially forests. Outstanding participation of young people leading	There is basin awareness and with some degree of demotivation of private (producers). The shortage of water moves the need to participate	Very notable due to the effects of poor solid waste management. Organization's Evaluation and persistence.
Incidence	At the operational level, a lot of joint action, with some political nuances. Basin councils see government as opponents	Link of micro watershed councils with watershed council. MAMSURPAZ recognizes the instances as coordination spaces. Opportunity with the advisory board	Work potential and analysis for learning. Larger areas in territory and population. Territorial coincidence and strong municipal participation through the PDM

## 5. Development of Basin Management

### 5.1 Basin organization competence

In 2015, with the NCG program's start of activities, the application of the General Water Law by the General Directorate of Water Resources is taken up with greater interest. In response to the demands of NCG, in September 2016, the PCM agreement 043-2016 is issued in the Council of Ministers. This agreement delegates the functions of ANA to the DGRH. This was an important step since this unit is empowered to give legal support to the creation and operation of basin and micro-basin councils. Proof of this is that, in January 2017, MiAmbiente published the ministerial agreement 0300-2017, through which the "Special Regulation of Basin Organizations" was approved.

In other words, it is NCG who has "pushed" the process so that the micro watershed councils obtain their legal status. The DGRH has had a lot of will, but very few resources and the uncertainty of not knowing how to act in the face of non-regulation of the law. The steps taken have not been sufficient since after three years not a single micro-watershed council has been legalized. This situation affects the mood of local actors. At the same time, their efforts through NCG offer a great learning opportunity for the State due to the organizational wealth achieved despite being the pioneers in this process. In addition, the NCG technical team has committed many energies to achieve this goal.

The barriers are now being presented in the flattest part of the road. As expressed by the DGRH, due to its responsibility as authority in the subject that should ensure the quality and sustainability of the process, the final approval of a file is not the only role in the legalization of basin organizations. They should also advise during the process of preparing the files. They indicate that the barriers to legalization could have been overcome by just maintaining a good channel of

communication and joint work during the process of preparing the dossiers of each of the micro basin councils and the watershed council. In our opinion, it seems to us that it is a very correct and responsible position.

The DGRH indicates that, in view of the real impossibility of implementing the General Water Law as the decree establishes, the government is analyzing the proposal to grant this agency definitively the powers of ANA. Given this scenario that seems to be the most viable, it is recommended that SDC through the Territorial Water Governance Program link this process to both initiatives. This route can accelerate and generate a high impact product such as the elaboration of the regulations to elaborate the water plans that are a necessity in the basins. Also, it could give the missing speed for the approval of the 15 files that are almost ready to leave MiAmbiente and pass to the Secretary of the Interior, who is responsible for issuing the legal entities.

A medium-term perspective is to include the training of local technical capacities (municipalities and associations) on the implementation of the General Water Law. It is also necessary to ensure that the process is being built jointly through a permanent link between the stakeholders involved in the basins and the governmental institutions in Tegucigalpa. The existence of these two SDC programs could mark an important milestone in the trajectory towards the construction of water governance in the country. In addition to involving the DGRH, the active participation of the National Institute of Forest Conservation and Development, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF) must also be included, which also has the mandate to approve integrated management plans in micro-basins, as well as the declaration of zones of forest vocation in those areas that provide water supply for human consumption.

## **5.2 Relation with local governments**

The Municipalities Law of Honduras (Decree 134-90) in article 12, numeral 4, article 13, numeral 7, and article 14, numeral 6, mention that it is the responsibility of the municipalities to preserve ecosystems and preserve the environment. In the particular case of the Goascorán River basin, the Municipal Governments have played a somewhat discreet role, but not negligible. In each of the three zones, very specific cases of activity and dynamism of the municipalities in the management of natural resources can be highlighted. An example that draws attention and that makes a difference with the rest of the country, is that most of the municipalities of the basin issued a resolution via municipal ordinance on "Zero Burning" in their municipal territories.

The most interesting thing is that this ordinance was issued in all the municipalities of the basin since 2015. This was promoted by the FAO PESA project that worked in the dry corridor of Central America. This municipal policy includes fines ranging from 5 thousand to 25 thousand Lempiras for those who fail to comply. The population recognizes this ordinance as an achievement and affirms that it has generated a real change in behavior with the use of fire in agricultural work. A greater appropriation is perceived in the high zone where in addition to fire, the leaders of the micro watershed councils relate this policy not to burn with the use of agrochemicals.

At present, in relation to the actions of the NCG program, the role of municipal governments is key, especially the counterpart contributions for the execution of community works. It highlights the specific case of the municipality of Santa Ana, which is contributing a fixed fee of 4000.00 lempiras (\$ 168.00) to maintain the chlorine bank.

This initiative was promoted based on the water quality diagnosis carried out by ADEC, which identifies the need to treat water by bacterial contamination (total and fecal coliforms) in most of the sources.

In addition to these isolated collaborations, attention is drawn to the willingness to collaborate with the Nuestra Cuenca Goascorán Program (PNCG), which was expressed by the mayors interviewed. In the opinion of the evaluation team, there has been a lack of greater empowerment

of the municipal governments of the approach and philosophy of our Goascorán Basin. Most see the program, first, as a project that offers an opportunity to raise funds for their jurisdiction. The Program must develop a more "aggressive" strategy of communication and relationship with local authorities and not leave everything to the will of their participation.

The relationship between local governments and NCG should not only be a responsibility of the technical teams of the zone, but also of the management levels of the program (UTG) and even of the superiors in Tegucigalpa. One way to improve the relationship would be to delegate to a person from the UTG the specific role of working on governance with the municipalities and associations in what is missing from the first phase. This is a way to prepare the ground for the second phase of the program and thus achieve leadership. An important step that NCG must push is the participation of the municipality of Goascorán in the MAFRON commonwealth.

Currently, several cooperation projects are committed to the joint implementation with the municipalities through the commonwealth. A very particular case is the project "*Increase in water and sanitation coverage and integrated management of the lower and middle basins of the Goascorán River*", financed by AECID and co-executed by the MAMSURPAZ Commonwealth. Another example is the initiatives of the Alliance for the Dry Corridor (ASC), with funds from USAID. This type of actions executed directly with the participation of the municipal governments and related to the management of the natural resources of the basin, are a great opportunity to develop leadership from the NCG through the newly organized institutional support commissions.

The micro watershed councils are the ideal multi-stakeholder platforms to achieve the integration and effective participation of the municipality. In the lower area, we highlight the coast of Amates micro-watershed council, where the local government plays a strategic role. This municipal leadership can be moved by the size of this micro-basin in which there is high territorial coincidence between the municipality and the micro-basin. Due to the above, an alternative to motivate the proactive participation of the municipalities in the agenda of the micro watershed councils are the three commonwealth.

### **5.3 Management and program management**

From the initial design stage, the weakness of the national institutionality responsible for promoting watershed management has been recognized and the main focus of the Program has been directed to the local level. In the "Entry in Matter", for example, the risks were evaluated as follows:

*The main context risks are related to the state's fragility ... As a consequence of the instability and generalized institutional politicization, the implementation of the Program will probably be affected by discontinuity of public policies, personnel changes and unpredictable budgets of the municipal governments and the relevant national institutions.*

In the same document, it was indicated that a "decisive dimension in the evaluation of offers" in the international bidding for program execution would be "the capacity to strengthen local capacity and facilitate local institutional development in a context-sensitive manner. "With the weak participation of central government institutions, the added value of the Program Steering Committee has been limited. No contribution from the IFC is reported to the strengthening of the watershed management capacities; the main contribution is the legalization of the micro watershed councils that the MiAmbiente DGRH proposes to approve in the first semester of 2018.

In practice, the management and management of the program has been in the hands of the mandated consortium with the active and continuous support of the SDC Cooperation Office in Honduras. There are several factors that have contributed to the difficulties in achieving the results foreseen in the Program Document and the logical framework. The members of the consortium indicate that the descriptions in the ProDoc of the level of organization and capacity of the existing basin and micro-watershed councils were erroneous or at least exaggerated. At the same time, it

was clearly identified in the internal evaluation of August 2017, that the four organizations that composed the consortium (now three, with the exit of RAIN), after more than two and a half years of work, followed parallel agendas and they had not yet managed to integrate their efforts into coordinated strategies appropriate to the conditions in each area of the basin. Additionally, the program staff points out that between 2015 and 2017 the internal administrative structure of the consortium, whose leader (IUCN) lacked a Honduran legal personality, placed financial decision making in Costa Rica or Europe and, therefore, generated bureaucratic requirements exaggerated and impeded an agile operation.

It is evident that the three remaining members of the consortium have learned from their initial difficulties and are overcoming their lack of integration and internal agility. Arrangements between IUCN and FUNDER, which does have a Honduran legal personality, have simplified financial procedures and made it possible to significantly speed up the implementation of activities. In addition, it was possible to observe during the meetings with the IUCN, FUNDER and IDE staff assigned to each area, which have largely been integrated into teams united and coordinated by the corresponding facilitator, who belongs to the Program Management Unit (PMU) .

The level of coordination with the other sub-contracted NGOs for particular jobs is varied. At one extreme, we find that the diagnoses and drafts of land use planning plans drawn up by ACRA are unknown by the board directors of the corresponding micro basins. The work of ADEC in ensuring adequate chlorination of water distributed by systems managed by water boards is widely known by all water boards; Not all of them identify it as part of NCG because several had received the support of ADEC previously.

The most integrated sub-contracted work is the facilitation of micro-watershed councils by ASOMAINCUPACO in the upper zone and Fundación Vida in the lower zone. Both NGOs are highly recognized and highly appreciated by the members of the councils and it seems that their staff coordinates their actions very closely with the members of the consortium staff working in both areas. We were struck by the fact that the community leaders with whom we speak in the upper zone speak of ASOMAINCUPACO as their own, and not as a contribution of a cooperation project, as they identify the members of the consortium. Likewise, both in the lower area and in the middle zone, it refers to the staff of Fundación Vida as if they were permanent staff in the area and mention various activities that support, in addition to what was done by the sub-contracts with the consortium.

The number of personnel of these companies and NGOs present in the NCG teams that work in coordination in each area is identified in the following table. The decimals are due to the fact that the coordinator of FUNDER's work with agro-businesses divides his time between the three zones. The table does not include the UTG staff located in the office in Marcala and works in the three zones.

Zone	UTG	IUCN	FUNDER	iDE	Sub-total	Fundación Vida	SOMAINCUPACO	Total
High	1	1	3+0.33	3	8.33	0	2	10.33
Middle	1	2	1+0.33	2	6.33	0	0	6.33
Lower	1		1+0.33	2	4.33	2	0	6.33

In the three zones, at the operational level, the importance of the relationship with the municipal governments and the commonwealth is seen. Due to the extremely small size of the municipalities and their lack of technical staff, it is important to deepen collaboration with the associations. The opportunity for close collaboration is particularly strong in the middle zone, where there is a complete coincidence between the technical support of the Basin Council Commission and the advisory board of MAMSURPAZ. Some municipalities in the lower area are also members of MAMSURPAZ and the MAFRON technical team would be interested in exploring ways to collaborate more directly with NCG and, in addition, with the Water Governance Project. In the upper zone, the technical team of MAMLESIP indicated its desire for closer collaboration.

It is also important to promote more complete coordination with other cooperation projects. In some cases, the procedures used by other donors, such as the numerical goals of USAID for the introduction of items that require agrochemicals, are contradictory with the objectives of local agro ecological management of the Program. Even when there are good relations with the technicians of other projects for common actions, such as training workshops, in the absence of leadership by the responsible national institutions, there is a lack of central support (from the UTG, IUCN, or SDC, as the case may be. ) to ensure greater strategic collaboration, especially with other donors, to avoid contradictions and optimize synergies. It is likely that the best opportunity to achieve good coordination with the other donors is in the context of close collaboration with the associations. In that case, it is the UTG that must take the initiative. In the event that the other projects do not have decision-making power at the level of the Basin or Commonwealth zones, the IUCN and / or the SDC OfCo will have to find a way to negotiate a methodological agreement that avoids the contradiction between donors.

#### **5.4 Sustainability**

The program foresees four income sources that could contribute to the economic sustainability of the councils and their community management of the micro-basins, sub-basins and the entire basin.

The first one is a municipal financial support. So far there has been a gradual advance of municipal support for the priority projects identified by the councils and financed mainly by the funds of the Program. In one case, the local government of Santa Ana has included a line item in the municipal budget to ensure the availability of the counterpart for such projects. Although the amounts of this support are small, they are important as a seal of collaboration between councils and municipal governments.

The second is the payment for environmental services. It is possible that the population in the municipalities in the middle and lower zones of the Basin eventually get to buy water from the upper zone and to pay the protectors of the sources. For this to happen, however, a much more advanced level of organization and coordination in the management of the basin must be achieved and, in addition, generate a new willingness in the population to pay for the volume of water supplied. It is not a realistic option in the short term.

The third option is the support of international cooperation. For the time being, it is what SDC provides and it is possible that other donors will join the support once the basin councils have legal personality and a proven management capacity. However, it would only be after a second phase of the program in which the SDC support is made directly to the councils and effectiveness in the administration of the resources is shown that this option becomes a realistic possibility.

The fourth option is an increase in the contribution of the communities themselves, through their voluntary work, and their direct financial contributions. In fact, this is how water boards work, once they get the necessary external contributions for their capital investments. It is also striking the growth of the funds managed by the rural banks and agro-businesses that receive technical assistance in the Program, which amounted to a total of more than \$ 2,000,000 in 2017, of which less than 20% came from the Program.

The great advantage of this fourth source is that its control and growth is already in the hands of the community actors who lead the micro watershed councils. Increase the contribution of this source is possible for themselves, without depending on the decisions taken by government agencies that do not control. In effect, the rural banks at this moment have a banking monopoly in the basin. Simultaneously, there has been a high level of collaboration of the local population in collective volunteer work. It is also observed that many residents in the lower area have a lot of capacity and spark for profitable, commercial and other activities.

Consequently, it is suggested that a Program priority during 2018 could be the support for agro-business and other activities with potential for profitability. For this, a number of specific activities could be focused, including, for example:

- Start to quantify the value of water, and promote more tours for sites with meters.
- Change the purchase (by rural banks and municipalities) of chemical inputs by organic fertilizers of local production.
- Explore new options of local economic development as activity of the councils, starting from the base in the rural banks:
  - Community input companies (chopped pasture and silage, bio-fertilizers), transport and marketing.
  - Community companies linked to water and forests that can incorporate young people with energy and ambition:
    - Production of flowers, honey, non-traditional fruit trees, forest products (vanilla, pepper, liquidambar balsam);
    - Sale of potable water for customers who currently buy from companies outside the basin;
    - Rural tourism (bird watching, cultural festivals);
    - Pisciculture.
  - Capitalization of community funds with interest on subsidized loans from participating banks.
- Green credits, with preferential interest rates for activities recommended in the corresponding micro-watershed plan.

## **5.5 Immediate priorities**

The following table summarizes the observed situation of the operative work in the three zones and some suggestions of priorities that could be adopted in 2018 to overcome the difficulties and take advantage of the opportunities present in each zone:

	Operative work	Suggested priorities for 2018
General	Limited progress with the DGRH. Good start of integration of zonal teams.	Explore a unique strategy of support to the national government with the Water Governance Project. Generate comprehensive reports by area (linked with council plans where possible) instead of separate reports by consortium member.
High Zone	Good internal coordination articulated with advice	Improve relations with municipalities. Develop a relationship with ANLESIP Increase strategic coordination with donors,
Middle Zone	Many good actions; they need to be articulated with each other and incorporated into a micro watershed vision	Look for more effective support for micro-watershed councils, similar to what Fundación Vida offers in the lower zone and ASOMAINCUPACO in the upper zone. Take advantage to the opportunity of close coordination with MAMSURPAZ and its advisory board, which coincides with the technical support of the Basin Council commission for the middle area
Lower Zone	Small team very united with complex task by size and variety of population and strength of advice	Renew participation of Fundación Vida. Support coordination between municipalities (Alianza, Goascorán, Caridad, Aramecina) and associations (MAFRON, MAMSURPAZ) Explore ways to approach the coastal zone with the Water Governance Project

## 6. Lessons Learned in Phase I

### 6.1 Context Key elements

- The community management development is framed by the biophysical and socioeconomic conditions of the particular micro basin.
- The most common "traditional" practices of producing corn, beans and livestock, especially on hillsides, increase vulnerability.
  - The adoption of practices in minor areas does not change this reality.
- The lack of water creates a vicious circle: the "technified" production of corn, beans and livestock requires water; Without water, "traditional" practices continue.
- By providing "benefits" that do not change "traditional" practices, donors and family members who send remittances subsidize the growth of vulnerability.

### 6.2 Key elements of the Program experience

- The focus on water, water boards, water sources and water uses is highly motivating and generates sustainable organizational efforts.
- The focus on credit and the strengthening of the banking monopoly of rural savings banks also psychosocially empowers local leaders.
- The community's leaders value the development of their abilities to manage money and perform actions that change the environment; this valuation transcends the value of the particular "benefit" of a loan or a project.

- The population responds to external interventions when they experience personal confidence with the "technicians"; People are more important than programs or projects.

### **6.3 Potentially key bases to build**

- Most local leaders are acquiring a basin consciousness. On this basis, the focus of the program should be built, extending the vision of community development to a broader inter-communal and inter-municipal vision that incorporates a water focus.
- The relationship with the Lenca community can be strengthened by supporting the recovery of seed protection and storage practices supported by the Lenca Sector Roundtable. The possibility of incorporating ancestral practices into technical assistance should be examined, identifying and incorporating older rural advisors for their ancestral knowledge.
- The municipalities, coordinated in the associations and supported by their technical teams, open the door to the alignment of donor contributions and a harmonized regulation (example: the "no burn").
- A financial triangulation between the donations of the cooperation, the credits provided by the banking monopoly in the hands of the community leaders in the rural banks, and the private capital of the remittances could allow:
  - Make major investments that provide water for consumption and production and break the vicious circle of lack of water / "traditional" production and increased vulnerability.

### **6.4 Lessons to optimize the efforts impact**

- The efforts aimed at the development of community management have borne fruit.
- Coordination with the Water Governance Project seems to have helped the DGRH overcome the difficulties it had in the micro-watershed councils documentation processing.
- The efforts aimed at municipal participation have been minimal but encouraging.
- Therefore, it makes sense:
  - Refine the efforts aimed at the micro level.
  - prioritize the efforts aimed at the meso- level.
  - coordinate with the Water Governance Project in the efforts aimed at the macro level.

## **7. Main conclusions and recommendations for a second phase**

### **7.1 Program goals**

In the second phase, the PGCC must make a transition from the management by a mandatory contractor to the management by the basin organizations: the watershed councils, the Basin Council, and the zonal committees of the Council, working in collaboration with the associations of each zone. For this to happen, it is important to involve these institutions in the planning process of the next phase.

We recommend involving the relevant actors in the process of defining the goals of three recommended courses of action to include in phase II.



The recommended first line of action is community work to address adaptation to climate change and the development of local economic sustainability.

We recommend involving the leaders of the micro-basin councils and the sub-basin council in choosing the goals of this action line. Specifically, we recommend that a two-day workshop could be held with two or three representatives from each council. The workshop should be based on the presentation of illustrative experiences of micro-watershed plans, of local investments and economic contributions, and of profitable community business ideas.

Then, the participants should be invited to collaborate in the identification of goals for 2022 that include:

- Number of micro basin councils working with plans in the implementation process that include specific works and actions that contribute to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, specifying:
  - priority areas of soil recovery, vegetative layers, and forest;
  - land use practices to promote with technical assistance and to favor with green credits;
  - Potential sources of water, inside or outside the micro-watershed;
  - strategies to ensure the long-term availability of water for human consumption and agricultural production.
- Economic amounts of local support for the micro watershed management plans implementation, to be provided through preferential loans from rural banks, payments for water use, voluntary work, financial contributions in substitution of voluntary work, and / or other local sources.
- Quantity and characterization of profitable community businesses, with the young people and women participation, to be established in each micro-basin, supported by investments from rural savings banks and remittances.
- Number of people trained in relevant areas (which must be characterized initially) in order to achieve the goals of organization, planning, contributions and local economic development.

The second line of action is inter-institutional work to address global water management in the Goascoran River Basin. To prepare a draft of goals of this action line, we recommend a series of four workshops: a one-day workshop in each area, followed by a two-day workshop with participation of the three zones. The guests to participate would be the Basin Council, the UTG, the members of the Basin Council commissions, the technical support and the technical team of the associations in each zone, and two representatives of the technical team of the Water Governance Project. In the call for workshops, the long duration of the SDC support horizon should be offered as an anchor for the harmonization of projects and programs of USAID, AECID and others, and their alignment with zonal plans in the Basin. Each zonal workshop should be based on an identification of the list of technical personnel working in the municipalities, associations, NGOs and projects and programs in force in the area whose responsibilities are related to environmental management, water systems, and / or economic development.

Then, the participants should be invited to collaborate in the preliminary identification of goals for 2022 that include:

- Quantity and identity of people to be incorporated in a continuous process of training in integral watershed management.
- Approximate number and preliminary identification of project concepts that merit pre-feasibility and / or feasibility studies due to their potential to contribute significantly to the needs resolution of water supply for human consumption and agricultural or psychic production in the Basin.

- Amounts coming from water payments and for environmental services, and from municipal, national and international cooperation budgets to dedicate to the choice, design, elaboration, implementation and operation of water supply projects for human consumption and agricultural production in the Basin.
- Actors that could collaborate in the definition, elaboration and implementation of a program of control of sources of contamination and solid and liquid waste management to recover water quality in Cuenca.

The third line of action is the monitoring and communication of biophysical and socioeconomic effects in the Basin. This line is essential for basin organizations to have the necessary information to plan their work, measure its effectiveness and communicate its processes and results to the population in the Basin. To collaborate in the preparation of a draft of the goals in this line of action, it is recommended to carry out work sessions with two different groups. To identify the sources and nature of the available climate information, technicians in MiAmbiente, ENEE and COPECO responsible for their respective hydro-climatic monitoring stations should be invited to participate in an exchange of information with UTG technicians and associations in Basin. At the same time, in order to identify sources of socioeconomic information and mechanisms for the compilation and communication of pertinent information for planning at the micro watershed level, representatives of the associations and community radio programs could be invited to exchange information with the personnel of the community. UTG in charge of communication for development.

Based on the information gathered in these two work sessions, the UTG and SDC OfCo, possibly with the support of a specialist contracted for this purpose, could prepare a draft of the design of the:

- a monitoring mechanism for biophysical and socio-economic conditions in the Basin, and
- popular communication procedures of the most pertinent biophysical and socio-economic information as part of a continuous communication system for development in the Basin.

## **7.2 Programmatic organization**

In parallel with the processes recommended for the preparation of the draft goals for the three lines of action, it is recommended that the OfCo initiate the terms of reference elaboration of an agent to be included in a tender at a national and international level. Members of the current mandatory consortium and its sub-contractors could participate in the tender as a whole, alone, or as members of another consortium.

It is recommended that the terms establish that the agent will have to comply with the following requirements:

- One management and operational team located in the basin, with sub-operative teams in each zone;
- Team technicians who have experience in the support of micro basin councils and key grassroots organizations (water boards, rural savings banks, women and youth groups, municipal governments) in the three zones of the Basin;
- The inclusion in the team of a specialist in communication for development in rural areas;

- The preparation of an initial proposal of appropriate accompaniment models for each of the three zones, including, among other elements, a preparation component of technical and managerial training opportunities for residents in the basin in:
  - Management of drinking water and irrigation systems,
  - The sectors in which agro-businesses and other community companies can be promoted in the corresponding area,
  - The management of solid waste including the production of organic fertilizers and the manufacture of products with plastic waste.
- A commitment to negotiate the way to move from a contract with SDC to a set of posts located in a secretariat of the Basin Council and / or units in the relevant Associations until later in the year 2021, with the understanding that the posts will be financed by SDC within a third phase of the program;
- A specialist in communication for development in rural areas; and
- Inclusion of women in at least 30% of positions in the technical team.

Additionally, taking into consideration the time required to carry out a bidding process, it is recommended that SDC establish a six-month extension of Phase I, under the current agent, to avoid a period without operational coordination between the two phases..

### **7.3 Management organization**

It is recommended to establish a Steering Committee composed of SDC, the Basin Council, the managers of the ICUs of the three associations and MiAmbiente. The representation of the Basin Council in the Steering Committee must include the person presiding over the Council and a representative from each area of the Basin.

It is also recommended the creation of an operational-technical committee composed of the head of the agent, the coordinators of the operational sub-teams of the three zones, and the program officer of SDC, who would have the right to participate at their convenience.

Additionally, it is recommended to establish a national basin policy advisory committee that includes, as a minimum, the DGRH, one or more representatives of the SDC Water Governance Project and the director of the contracted agent for the management of the Community Management Program of Basins.

## Annex 1. Participants in meetings and conversations with the evaluation team

### National

#### **SDC**

Geneviève Federspiel Singh, Head International Cooperation, Office of Swiss Cooperation in Honduras  
Manuel Martínez, Program Officer, SDC, Office of Swiss Cooperation in Honduras  
Sohrab Tawackoli, Water Governance Program Coordinator

#### **Government institutions**

Carmen Cartagena, General Director of Water Resources, MiAmbiente, and 4 technicians  
Oscar Raudales, Head Department of Watersheds, Institute of Forest Conservation (ICF)

#### **Council of the Goascorán River Basin**

Flora Hernández, Managers of Protected Areas, President  
Rony Funez, MAFRON, Mayor of Aramecina, Vice-President  
Judy Espinal, Micro basin Council of Apane, Secretary  
Alexander Euceda, Board of Aramecina, Treasurer  
Famelicia Santos, Sub-basin Council of Apasapo, Fiscal  
Roy Martínez, Sub basin Council of Cimarrón, Vocal Zona Alta Eulalio  
Maldonado, Mayor of San Antonio del Norte, Vocal Middle Zone Melkis  
Maradiaga, Sub basin Council of La Victoria, Vocal Lower Zone Rosarío  
García, Vocal Mesa Vocal Lenca Indigenous Sector board  
Ruben Turcios, MAFRON, City hall of Charity, President Board of Surveillance  
Osman Alvarado, Secretary Board of Surveillance

#### **Consortium**

Adalberto Padilla, IUCN  
Miguel Ángel Bonilla, FUNDER  
Freddy Rodríguez, iDE  
Carlos Urdaneta, iDE  
Oscar Muñoz, FUNDER  
Orlando Mejía, RAIN

#### **Technical and Management Unit (UTG**

)Edwin Rodríguez  
Gerardo Torres  
Ruben Roberto  
Balbina Olivera  
Marlon Martínez  
Lesli Gabarrete  
Walter Chinchilla

#### **Support Institutions**

Elías Enrique Mejía, ADEC  
Diana Cáliz, ADEC  
Antonio Chavarría, ASOMAINCUPACO  
Julio Coll, ASOMAINCUPACO  
Julio Cárcamo, Fundación Vida  
Jorge Alberto Gerardo, Fundación Vida  
Rovell Ivan Guillen, Fundación Vida

#### **Other development partners**

Manuel Blásquez, AECID Head of Program, Cooperation Technical Office in Honduras  
Diana Barahona, Coordinator, USAID Local Governability Program.  
Jaime Barahona, Pespirenses Development Association (ADEPES) and Berlin Samaritans (ASB)

## Higher Zone

### **Consortium Team**

Elvin Sosa. UTG. Facilitator.

Walter Chinchilla. IUCN. Specialist.

Elder Suazo. IUCN. Administrative technician

Walter Pereira. FUNDER. Adviser.

Edgardo Díaz. FUNDER. Technical Adviser.

Paul Vásquez. FUNDER. Finance Adviser.

Adonai Osorio. FUNDER. Agribusiness Coordinator.

Edward Girón. iDE. Facilitator.

Alexis Guerrero. iDE. Facilitator.

Nelson Arrioga. iDE. Facilitator.

Delmen Donaire. ASOMAINCUPACO. Facilitator.

### **Municipal Government of Santa Ana**

Germán Francisco Mendoza, Mayor

### **Associations of Lenca Municipalities of the Sierra de la Paz (MAMLESIP)**

Andrea Jiménez, environmental technique

Francisco José López, Intermunicipal Technical Unit Coordinator

### **Board of Directors of the Cancire Micro-watershed Council**

List of attendees not available

### **Leaders of local organizations**

María de Jesús Gómez

María Teresa Correa

Julian Mendoza

Jesús Marín Agueta

Osman Martínez

Miriam Yaneth López Mendoza

### **Production families**

Mr. And Mrs. Magdaleno Corea, community of Santa Cruz, Guajiquiro

Mrs and Mr. María Gloria Martínez, community of El Tejar, Opatoro

Santos Olvin Vásquez, community of Valle de Ángeles, Opatoro

### **Local managers of community work (expansion of the Santa Ana Centro water system)**

List of attendees not available

### **Responsible and local beneficiaries of community work (water harvest project in Las Trancas)**

List of attendees not available

### **Focus Group**

Roy Martínez

Donaldo Sánchez

Franklin Willian Corea

Norma Hernández

Erodita Sánchez

Irene Sanchez

## Middle Zone

### **Consortium Team**

Gerardo Torres. UTG. Facilitator.  
Hugo Flores. IUCN. Governance Technician.  
Roque Almendares. IDE. Agricultural Manager  
José Luis Rodas. IDE. Facilitator.

Olvin Vásquez. IUCN. Facilitator.  
José Amílcar Mendoza. FUNDER. Facilitator.  
Francisco Javier Santos. IDE. Facilitator.  
Adonai Osorio. FUNDER. Agribusiness Coordinator.

### **Municipal Government of San Antonio del Norte**

Eulalio Maldonado, Mayor

### **Municipal Government of Aguanqueterique**

Mirna López, Vice Mayor  
Oscar Dagoberto Chévez, Responsible for Environmental Unit  
Marta Elena Cantos Chévez, Municipal Women's Office Coordinator

Juan Miguel Mejía Moreno, Alderman and ex-Mayor

### **Commonwealth of Municipalities of the South of the Department of La Paz (MAMSURPAZ)**

Rita Servellón, Responsible for Natural Resources  
Rosendo Zavala, Intermunicipal Technical Unit Coordinator

### **Board of Directors of the Apacilina Micro basin Council**

Dominga Moreno, President  
Marina Río, Fiscal  
Modesta Maldonado, Rural Bank representative

Víctor Manuel Castillo, Secretary Elida  
José Bonilla, Surveillance Board  
José Santos Mejía, City hall representative

### **Board of director of the Resbaloso Micro basin**

Bertha Amaya, President  
Flora Idalia Cruz Ruiz, Treasurer  
Francisco E.G.V, Secretary 2  
Deomedes Velasquez, Assemblyman

José Amílcar Valle Amaya, Secretary  
Lesbia Francisca Amaya, Secretary 1  
Melvin Antonio Amaya, President, Supervisory Board

### **Leaders of local organizations**

Marta Isabel Fúnez. Rural bank. President.  
Digno Maldonado. Rural bank. President

José Arturo Herrera. Cofradía Microbasin. Treasurer.

### **Producing Families**

Miguel Admindo Ruiz and family, Community El Barranco.  
Reina Suazo and family, Community of Cañas  
Isidro Marcia, tilapia producer, San Antonio del Norte

### **Local managers of community work in Ojo de Agua (new water tank)**

Leydis Tessenia Gómez. Rural Bank. Secretary.  
Treasurer.  
Alcides Vidal Gómez. Rural Bank. President.  
Santos Irene Gómez Gómez. Board of potable water. President  
Belsi Germin Amaya Gómez. Board of potable water. Treasurer

Eda Maely Mejía Ruiz. Rural Bank.

Deysis Siomosa Ososto. Board of potable  
Water. Secretary

### **Local managers of community work in El Jicaro (Pitahaya Project)**

Board of water President

### **Focus Group**

José Angel Suazo, Community of Barrancaray  
Alido Acosta Moreno, Community of Torrecilla. Rural Bank Secretary.  
Teodora Gómez Canales, Community of El Moray  
Glenda Aracely Moreno Reyes, Community of Las Cañas. Women Group  
Miguel Adencillo, Community of El Barranco  
Omin Efrain Velasquez Amaya, Community of El Barranco  
Luciana Mejía, Community of El Jicaro  
Emin Luciana Mejía Maldonado, Community of El Jicaro

## Lower Zone

### **Consortium Team**

Melvin Nuñez. UTG. Facilitator.

Celin Maradiaga Huete. IDE. Facilitator.

Adonai Osorio. FUNDER. Agribusiness Coordinator.

Marlón Martínez Mendoza. FUNDER. Facilitator.

Denis Omar Izaguirre. IDE. Facilitator.

### **Municipal Government of Charity**

Ruben Turcios, Mayor

Melkis Maradiaga, technician

### **Municipal Government of Goascorán**

Antonio Zelaya, Mayor

### **Municipal Government of Alliance**

Faustino Manzanares, Mayor

### **Association of Border Municipalities (MAFRON)**

Eudubigis Gutierrez, Intermunicipal Technical Unit Coordinator

### **Council of Micro basin La Victoria**

Matilde Reina Mejia, President

Concepción Romero Galvez, Treasurer

Luis Maldonado, Representative Caja Rural, Secretary 3

4

Dubal Omar Arias Moreno, Representative Rural Bank, Fiscal

Marvin Yovan Saravia, Board of Water representative

Lesly Jasmin Galo Mejia, Secretary

Letis Rancy Bonilla Galeano, UMA, Secretary 1

Irma Yolanda Mejia, representative Rural bank Secretary

José Luis Sarabia, Board of Water representative

Elmer Roney Amaya, Board of Water representative

### **Council of sub basin Apasapo**

Famelicia Santos. Basin Council of the Goascorán River. Treasurer.

Victoriano Alvarado. Sub Basin Council. President.

Elsy Yaneth Molina Cruz Sub Basin. Secretary.

Bibian Gómez. Sub Basin Council. Secretary 1.

Liciola Enecolia. Sub Basin Council. Surveillance Secretary.

Alexander Roney Euceda Padilla. Sub Basin Council. Surveillance Secretary.

José Munguía Hernández. Micro basin Goascorán. Secretary 1.

René Alvarado Ventura. Micro basin Goas. Young President

Bruno Alvarado Méndez. Health Committee. Secretary.

Dunia Minellois Garcia Bonilla. Secretary, Parents Society. Secretary 1.

Catalina Ventura. Church Coordinator.

Luis Omar Molina. Board of water. President.

Santiago Villalobos. Patronage. President.

Juan José Villalobos. President of Health. Fiscal.

### **Costa de Amates Micro-basin Council**

José Reyes, President

Luis Alonzo Guevara, Fiscal

### **Leaders of local organizations**

Leillis Bonilla. Alcaldía Caridad. UMA. Micro basin Council secretary

Ovidio Vásquez. Soprocama, cashew company. Plant manager.

Elsa Glaydis Guevara. Rural Bank Siempre Vive. Treasurer.

### **Producing Families**

Marlon Zambrano and family, Community of El Chaparral

Marcelina Euceda and family, Community of La Laguna

Norma Manzanares and family, Community of El Tablon

### **Responsible parties for community works (Rural Banks and bridges in Terreros)**

Marcelina Euceda, Rural Bank President, La Laguna

Water board President of Terreros

### **Focus Group**

List of attendees not available

## **ANNEX 2**

Scheme that groups the objectives, key issues, transversal axes, and guiding questions raised in the Evaluation Terms of Reference.

### **1. Introduction**

### **2. Striking aspects of the biophysical and socioeconomic context**

### **3. Institutional and politic Context**

Relevance of our Goascoran basin in the current context and the Water Governance approach in Honduras. Analyze the government interest and commitment (national and local) with the establishment of basin organizations, their political and institutional capacity to apply the water law, and the interest and capacity of the local authorities involved to carry out watershed management.

#### **3.1 Interest and commitment of the national government**

Are the national public institutions (MiAmbiente and others) supporting and facilitating the achievement of the program results?

#### **3.2 Interest and commitment of local governments**

Are local governments supporting and facilitating the achievement of the program results?

#### **3.3 Interest and capacity of the population and relevant local organizations**

Does the organized population in watershed organizations have the real interest and capacity to build a sustainable territorial approach? Are rural savings banks and environmental compensation mechanisms sustainable models that contribute to the integral development of micro-watersheds?

#### **3.4 Role and capacity of micro watershed councils**

Do basin organizations reflect representativeness and favor incidence?

### **4. Achievements and difficulties**

Progress in the effects and goals of the program with respect to the Logical Framework. Verify if the modality of integration and intervention of the consortium facilitating the program contributes to the achievement of the effects and products foreseen in the PRODOC and Logical Framework. Value the processes of economic and environmental sustainability in the Goascoran basin.

#### **4.1 Training, organization and technical assistance**

Relevance, compliance and effectiveness of the training system and horizontal training, of the service providers, and of the technologies of ACC and DRR.

Do the training and technical assistance services respond to the long-term effects and products expected from the program? Relevance, compliance and effectiveness of local rural financial services and ACC and DRR works. Sociocultural relevance, inclusion, respect for indigenous rights, psychosocial approach, customs and traditions. Needs and participation of youth, women and indigenous peoples, their role in relation to water resources and community decision-making.

Validate the changes (quantitative and qualitative) achieved in social inclusion according to the targeting matrix and Psychosocial (psa) at the level of the program's target groups. Does the program's contribution in gender equity, psychosocial approach, social and ethnic insertion allow a more inclusive approach to the population?

#### **4.2 Water governance and management**

Functioning and sustainability of basin organizations under a Water Governance approach. Participation of municipal and central government, associations and organisms of basins-sub-basins-micro-basins. Communication strategy and knowledge management.

Validate the changes (quantitative and qualitative) achieved in the theme of governance according to the matrix and psychosocial targeting (PSA) at the level of the program's target groups.

Do organizational services respond to the long-term effects and products expected from the program? Do current water management and governance actions favor conflict management?

#### **4.3 Original goals achievement**

Summary of progress and difficulties in relation to the Logical Framework indicators.

#### **4.4 Management and Program management**

Evaluate the performance of management and instances of the program coordination.

Is the monitoring and evaluation system of the program appropriate and useful? Does the monitoring system and the periodic reports contribute to the management of knowledge, communication and decision making (steering) in the program?

What is the added value of the Program's Executive and Operational Committees? The level of coordination between IUCN, consortium partners and UTG has influenced the progress of the program?

How is the coordination of our Goascoran basin evaluating how to evolve in phase II towards a more agile and effective structure of the management and instances of program coordination (including the role of the consortium, UTG, partners and governing bodies - Steering Committee and Operating Committee).

What should be the model of integration and internal management (Steering Committee, Operational, Management, consortium, UTE)?

How to make coordination or synergies more effective with SDC projects and other donors in the Gulf region of Fonseca?



#### **4.5 Sustainability**

Value the processes of economic and environmental sustainability in the Goascoran basin. Relevance, compliance and effectiveness of the mechanisms and instruments of economic-environmental sustainability according to eco-systemic and agro-business services. Coordination and participation of municipal investments in community management of the basin.

#### **5. Prospective vision**

Identify the necessary adjustments in the modality of integration and facilitating intervention for a phase II. Propose basic adjustments that allow achieving greater prominence and decision making of the basin organizations in a phase II according to the institutional and legal framework of the country.

Propose adjustments to the processes of economic and environmental sustainability in the Goascoran basin; including priority actions for a phase II in the organization, consolidation and territorial leadership of the basin organizations.

##### **5.1 Learned lessons**

What are the main lessons learned to be rescued from the experiences of Phase I?

##### **5.2 Program goals**

In the logical framework of phase II which mechanisms or products should be maintained or incorporated?

What changes should be made to the monitoring and evaluation system in a phase II?

What should be the participation and dynamics of public institutions in a phase II?

##### **5.3 Program Organization**

What adjustments should be made in water management and governance actions? Can basin organizations participate more effectively in decision making?

How to adjust rural savings banks and economic mechanisms of environmental compensation to environmental sustainability in the micro basins and the Goascoran basin?

How to have an integrating and more effective approach in gender equity, psychosocial approach, social and ethnic insertion?

##### **5.4 Management organization**

Evaluate how to evolve in phase II a more agile and effective structure of the management and instances of program coordination (including the role of the consortium, UTG, partners and governing bodies - Steering Committee and Operating Committee).

What should be the model of integration and internal management (Steering Committee, Operational, Management, consortium, UTE)?

How to make coordination or synergies more effective with SDC projects and other donors in the Gulf region of Fonseca?

Evaluation grid for SDC's projects / programs evaluation

Key aspects based on the CAD criteria	Score (select only one answer for each question)	Justification - mandatory (briefly explain the main points and refer to the chapter (s) where the information justifying their evaluation is included)
<b>Relevance evaluation</b>		
1. To what extent are the objectives of the SDC projects / programs objectives coherent with the demands and needs of the target groups (including specific requirements regarding gender).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Very good: Fully consistent <input type="checkbox"/> Good: Largely consistent <input type="checkbox"/> Poor: Only partially coherent <input type="checkbox"/> Bad: Very little or nothing coherent <input type="checkbox"/> Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	The producing families in the Basin need water and the local organizations are motivated to collaborate in the management of the micro-watersheds. Chapter 3.3.
2. To what extent the objectives of SDC projects / programs are coherent with the demands and needs of the counterpart country (institutions and society), as well as with its sectoral policies and strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good: Consistency with the demands and needs of society and in line with the main sectoral policies and strategies are evident <sup>2</sup> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good: There is coherence with the demands and needs of society and with the main sectoral policies and strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Deficient: Consistency with the demands and needs of society is not visible, but there is a coherence with the main sectoral policies and the strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Bad: It is not coherent <input type="checkbox"/> Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	The government has adopted policies of Watershed management but has not allocated the necessary resources to implement them. Chapter 3.1.
3. To what extent the design of the projects / programs is adequate to achieve the goal and objectives (definition of target groups, choice of approach and operational elements, formulation of components, choice of counterparts, coherence with policies and experiences of SDC).	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good: Completely adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good: Largely adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Deficient: Only partially adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor: Very little or not at all adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Not evaluated / Not applied <sup>1</sup>	<b>The focus on community management corresponds to the political and institutional conditions of Honduras where the national support is very weak. The difficulties encountered are implementation, not design. Chapter 4.2</b>
<b>Evaluation of effectiveness</b>		
4. Level of compliance with the expected objectives at the level of the <u>expected effects</u> (outcomes), taking into account their relative importance. If possible, establish a distinction between the qualitative and quantitative objectives that have been achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good: Fully achieved or exceeded by far <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good: Largely achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Deficient: Partially successful <input type="checkbox"/> Poor: Hardly achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not evaluated / Not applied <sup>1</sup>	Significant progress has been made towards the fulfillment of both effects. Chapter 4.3.
5. To what extent do the projects / programs contribute to poverty reduction, inclusion and / or vulnerability reduction? <sup>3</sup> .	<input type="checkbox"/> Very good: Solid evidence of contribution <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good: Contribution tests <input type="checkbox"/> Deficient: Few proofs of contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Bad: No proof of contribution <input type="checkbox"/> Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	The participating families report improvements in family economy for technical assistance, access to credit and improvements in water systems. It is necessary to improve the recovery of soils and forests. Chapter 4.1.

<sup>1</sup> This category applies a. if the ToRs of the evaluation explicitly exclude the evaluation of this criterion and / or of the main aspect (s), or b. if there is no information available to evaluate this criterion.

<sup>2</sup> Policies and strategies should not be against the needs of society (particularly in terms of governance and human rights).

<sup>3</sup> The dimensions that can be considered are: a) economic (income and assets); b) human capacities (health, education, nutrition); c) ability to participate in society (status and dignity); d) political capacities (institutions and policies); e) resilience to external shocks.

6. To what extent the expected results achieved contribute to improving governance from a systemic perspective <sup>4</sup> .	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: Solid evidence of contribution Good: Contribution tests Deficient: Few proofs of contribution Bad: No contribution Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	There is an acceptable progress in the creation and strengthening of micro watershed councils. More collaboration with local governments and associations is lacking Chap. 4.2
7. To what extent the expected results achieved contribute to the specific objectives regarding gender.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: Solid evidence of contribution Good: Contribution tests Deficient: Few proofs of contribution Bad: No contribution Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	There is active participation and leadership cases of women but a strategy aimed at responding to the interests and needs of women in relation to water is lacking.
<b>Efficacy evaluation</b>			
8. To what extent the relationship between resources (mainly financial and human) and the time required (eg, delays with respect to planning) and the results achieved is appropriate (cost-benefit ratio, RCB).	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: positive RCB, based on a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) Good: Positive RCB, on the basis of a qualitative justification Deficient: Deficient RCB, based on a qualitative justification Bad: RCB demonstrated negative Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	The mandatory consortium took a long time to integrate their various supports and still not articulate them adequately with the needs and plans in each micro basin Cap. 4.4
9. To what extent the approaches and strategies used by SDC projects / programs are considered effective (cost-effectiveness).	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: Very effective Good: Effective Poor: Partially effective Bad: Ineffective Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	The lack of integration of the various types of support has impeded an optimal impact on watershed management. Chap. 4.4
<b>Sustainability assessment</b>			
10. Probability that the positive results (outputs and outcomes) will continue once the external support has ended. Potential contextual risks should also be considered.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: Very likely (based on evidence) Good: Probable (based on evidence) Deficient: Unlikely (based on evidence) Poor: Unlikely (based on evidence) Not evaluated / Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	Some of the micro watershed councils already demonstrate commitments to continuity. Others expect to find support from various sources. Chap. 3.4
11. To what extent partner organizations are able to carry out the activities. It is important to take into account the technical and financial capacity, human resources and the importance of the activity for the organization in question.	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good: Great capacity (also to continue the development without support) Good: Necessary capacity Poor: Low capacity (requires more support) Bad: Capacity still too weak Not evaluated / Not applied <sup>1</sup>	as it has always been planned, at least one more phase is needed so that the Basin Council and the micro-basin councils, with the governments and local organizations, achieve their own management of the Basin. Chap. 5

Additional Information (if necessary):

Project: Watershed Community Management Program

Adviser: Josué León, Sayra Taleno, and Andrew Blackwell

Date: march 27, 2018

<sup>4</sup> The dimensions that can be considered are: a) structural (well-founded policies, laws that correspond to basic human rights obligations, level of decentralization / concerted action at various levels / cooperation); b) good governance in the performance / interaction of responsible actors / institutions (principles of good governance: participation, transparency, accountability, equality and non-discrimination, effectiveness and efficiency, rule of law); c) capacities, behavior, empowerment of actors / institutions for positive change; d) consideration of the important dimensions of governance at the global or regional level.

Annex 4. Summary of progress and difficulties in relation to the indicators in the Logical Framework.

Effect 1 <sup>1</sup> : Producing families and community organizations have adopted and implemented technologies and works of CCA and DRR with sustainability mechanisms							
No.	Indicators	Base line	Goal	2017	2015-17	Observation UTG	Our Observation
11.1	# producing families adopt ACC and RRD technologies	0	2500	1000	2182	Families that have validated and adopted a menu of 60 soil, forest and water management technologies. It refers to families that have farm-house plans (Detail in IDE report, annex 1)	The baseline is false. Furthermore, this indicator does not ensure that the measures adopted point to CCA and DRR in the farms and micro watersheds in question.
11.2	Improves the water quality level in 36 sites of hydrological significance in the micro-basins	100% of the 36 sites in micro basins present some degree of contamination	With bacteriological, physical or chemical levels within allowed	Measurement in the 36 sites of hydrological significance in micro-basins during the rainy season	baseline.	The degree of contamination of the micro watersheds has been established based on 13 water quality parameters. The results have been socialized with most of the councils and dialogues have started to agree on actions to reduce pollution based on recommendations made. (ADEC report in annex 2)	Hardly measurable and achievable due to the delay in establishing a baseline.
11.3	# Community works respect the maintenance regulations.	0	160	Out of the 40 works built, 75% have a written sustainability strategy	40	See example of sustainability strategy and capitalization in annex 3. Its application will be verified during the first half of 2016.	Our impression is that the water boards do their best to maintain the works, mainly through manual work or payments required by the associates. However, the rates in general are very low.
11.4		8 qq /mz corn 5 qq / mz bean <sup>3</sup>	5% increase	No measurement was made in 2017	14 qq/Mz corn 8 qq/Mz bean (2016)		We could not verify or assess this measurement. Our impression is that the areas included in the samples may be only a minor part of the farms.
11.5	USD mobilized by credit and savings in rural banks and other allied financial institutions.	0	USD 1,000,000	1,000,000	USD 1,311,827	The achievement corresponds to amounts placed from the rural savings fund and other financial institutions from 2015 until December 2017 (See detail in report FUNDER, Annex 4)	We doubt the zero of the baseline. However, it is evident that this indicator will be exceeded.
11.6	# Producers with access to credit	0	3,000	783	1,610	39% are women (See detail in FUNDER report, annex 4)	We seriously doubt the zero of the baseline. It must be revised.

<sup>1</sup> This effect can be presented more correctly as: Producer families adopt CCA and DRR technologies and community organizations maintain works of ACC and RRD

<sup>2</sup> There is a menu of technologies with agro ecological practices

<sup>3</sup> Based on the measurement of the Surcompte Project in 2014-2015 cycle

Effect 2: The micro watershed councils function in an organized manner and promote sustainable integral development in coordination with the Basins Council of Goascorán and the municipal governments.							
No.	Indicators	Baseline	Goal	2017	2015-2017	Observation UTG	Our observation
12.1	# councils of basins (basin, sub-basin, micro-basin) legalized	0	16	15 files delivered to the DGRH	15 records in the DGRH for corresponding resolution (See list of files in annex 5)	During the year, 3 file updates were made to adjust them to legal and technical norms in construction. By the end of the year the legal requirements and almost completed the technical requirements established by the DGRH.	
12.2	# tips that meet representative criteria defined in the internal regulations (Private Members, SC, public)	0	16	15	15	Democratic election processes have been carried out based on special electoral regulations	They all have.
12.3	% of annual plans of the basins (At the level of the basin, sub-basin and micro-basin) implemented with most of its activities fulfilled.	0	70%	59.4%	10 councils have carried out the execution qualification of their 2017 annual action plans	The 10 self-rated tips surpass the 55% goal foreseen in the fulfillment of their action plans. 6 councils had not made their auto-qualification in December 2017.	
12.4	Number of municipal governments with a defined policy of resources allocation for micro-basins management plans	1	8	6	6	Policy construction is in process and it will continue after the elections in the country. In 2018 the SGDHD will be integrated, reviewing the regulations on transfers and municipal planning.	part of the management plan.
12.5	% identified conflicts that are resolved in the micro-basin councils	0%	51%		In addition to conflict management in 2017, half of the basin organizations have incorporated into their action plans the prevention and management of conflicts that go through a training for their understanding and identification	Elaborated in a participatory form a matrix and map of socio-environmental conflicts for disputes derived from the access, possession, use, control, exclusion and protection of the water resource in the micro-watersheds. In 2018 the participation of the conflict unit of the SGDHD will be managed.	of the processes.
12.6	# watershed councils that implement compensation mechanisms for the use of environmental goods and services	1	8	0	4 (accumulated)	The cumulative advance corresponds to the year 2016. In 2017 there have been no new initiatives in this regard. Two educational tours programs were made to La Ceiba that must generate proposals in 2018. This subject is included in consulting in economic financial instruments courses.	
12.7	# tips implement social and financial audit	1	16	4		Social audit of the projects was carried out of community works. Cancire, Río Leon, Paneaguara and El Resbaloso as a whole between micro watershed council and CCT	surveillance committees work.

## Annex 5. Examples of agricultural practices



*Patio practices that improve the family economy but do not rectify the erosion of the soil on the slopes*



*One of several corn sowing areas on hillsides on the same farm*



Barriers in curve and forest sowing that retain water and regenerate soils, started years before the beginning of the Program



*Traditional practices of seed selection and use of landraces*